

Remarks/Arguments

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of the original Claim 20.

New Claims

Claim 34 is a method claim paralleling apparatus Claim 1. Claim 36 substantially recites limitations from Claim 1. No new matter has been added.

Election/Restriction

The Examiner withdrew Claim 31, stating that the Claim was not part of the elected embodiment. Applicant disagrees. Claim 31 recites a pallet for supporting an armature by a shaft, which is the elected embodiment. In contrast, the withdrawn embodiment supports an armature by an armature stack, which is not recited in Claim 31.

Applicant courteously requests that Claim 31 be included among the elected claims.

The Rejection of Claims 1, 17, 19-25, 27, 31, and 32 Under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 17, 19-25, 27, 31, and 32 Under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner cited the limitation “said means for supporting” in Claims 1 and 32 and the limitation regarding a hidden shaft in Claim 31.

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to replace “means for supporting” with “support means,” which has proper antecedent basis. Therefore, Claim 1 is no longer indefinite and Claims 17, 19, 21-25, and 27, dependent from Claim 1 also are not indefinite. Claim 20 has been cancelled.

Applicant has cancelled Claim 32.

Claim 31 has been amended to remove the limitation “hidden shaft” and to clearly recite the structural relationship of the shaft to the remainder of the armature as fully supported in the specification and drawings, for example, on page 16, line 24 to page 17, line 1 and Figures 27-30.

Applicant courteously requests that the rejection be removed.

The Rejection of Claims 1, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 27, and 32 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 27, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,735,219 (Kirker). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1

Amended Claim 1 recites: “further comprising actuating means, carried by said pallet, suitable for causing said first and said second support means to approach and/or move away from each other in said substantially axial direction with respect to said armature axis at said moment of receiving and/or releasing said portion of said armature.”

Kirker does not teach, suggest, or motivate an actuating means for causing the support means to approach or move away from each other. Kirker teaches that the support members are held in place by springs, for example: “spring 30 inhibits support member 12 from moving while the work piece is being worked upon or transported on pallet 10.” (Col. 4, lines 60-63). Further, Kirker does not teach, suggest, or motivate a means, carried by the pallet, for causing the support means to approach or move away from each other. Kirker implies that bases 12 and 14 can be displaced by hand or possibly by some other means that is not part of, or carried by, pallet 10.

Kirker does not show any element of pallet 10 that can displace members 12 or 14 as recited in Claim 1. For example, spring 30 does not and cannot act to displace member 12 in a direction parallel to an axis for an armature being held in the member.

Kirker does not teach all the elements of Claim 1, therefore, Claim 1 is novel with respect to Kirker. Claims 17, 19, 22, 24, and 27, dependent from Claim 1, enjoy the same distinction with respect to Kirker.

Claims 20 and 32 have been cancelled, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

New Claim 34

New Claim 34 is a method claim reciting elements of Claim 1 not taught, suggested, or motivated by Kirker. Therefore, the arguments regarding Claim 1 are applicable to Claim 34 and

Claim 34 is novel with respect to Kirker. Claim 35, dependent from Claim 34, also is novel with respect to Kirker.

New Claim 36

Claim 36 recites elements of Claim 1 not taught, suggested, or motivated by Kirker. Therefore, the arguments regarding Claim 1 are applicable to Claim 36 and Claim 36 is novel with respect to Kirker. Claims 37 and 38, dependent from Claim 36, also are novel with respect to Kirker.

Applicant courteously requests that the rejection be removed.

The Rejection of Claims 21, 25, and 28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 21, 25, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirker. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant has shown that Kirker does not teach, suggest, or motivate all the elements of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 is patentable over Kirker. Claims 21 and 25, dependent from Claim 1, enjoy the same distinction with respect to Kirker.

Claim 28 has been cancelled, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Applicant has shown that Kirker does not teach, suggest, or motivate all the elements of new Claim 34. Therefore, Claim 34 is patentable over Kirker. Claim 35, dependent from Claim 34, enjoys the same distinction with respect to Kirker.

Applicant has shown that Kirker does not teach, suggest, or motivate all the elements of new Claim 36. Therefore, Claim 36 is patentable over Kirker. Claims 37 and 38, dependent from Claim 36, enjoy the same distinction with respect to Kirker.

Applicant courteously requests that the rejection be removed.

The Objection of Claim 23 as Being Dependent Upon a Rejected Base Claim

Claim 23 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 is novel

Attorney Docket No. ATOP:106US
U.S. Patent Application No. 10/604,641
Reply to Office Action of October 27, 2006
Date: February 26, 2007

with respect to Kirker. Therefore, Claim 23, dependent from Claim 1, no longer depends from a rejected base claim.

Applicant courteously requests that the objection be removed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of Claim 33.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/C. Paul Maliszewski/

C. Paul Maliszewski
Registration No. 51,990
Customer No. 24041
Simpson & Simpson, PLLC
5555 Main Street
Williamsville, NY 14221-5406
Telephone No. 716-626-1564

Dated: February 26, 2007
CPM/